

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 01 2007

PATENT
P56924REMARKS

The indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 1-13 and 17-20 is appreciated.

A. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph based upon a number of deficiencies kindly noted by the Examiner. Accordingly the above amendment is believed to correct for those deficiencies.

B. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as rendered obvious and unpatentable, over Cook et al. (US 6,032,020) in view of Weissman et al. (US 6,501,942). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reason(s).

Claim 14

Claim 14 is directed towards an apparatus for transmitting sector ~~signal~~ signals in multi-sector in-building repeater, and calls for, in part, the apparatus to comprise:

a master transmitting unit for receiving multi-sector signals of a carrier frequency from [[the]] a base station.

Here, the Examiner has applied only Cook, referring to Cook's Fig. 2, elements 136, 236, 336 with respect to the claimed *master transmitting unit*; elements 128, 228, 328 with respect to the claimed *receiving multi-sector signals of a carrier frequency*; and col. 3, line 3 ("cellular base station") with respect to the claimed *base station*.

PATENT
P56924

First, it should be noted that Cook's description of a "cellular base station" is written with respect to Cook's description of Fig. 1, not Fig. 2, and there is no description with respect to Fig. 1 to suggest that one of ordinary skill in the art would have considered internal signal 44 (col. 2, line 62) to comprise *multi-sector signals of a carrier frequency* since FIG. 1 shows a block diagram depicting a single-band repeater system, whereas FIG. 2 shows a block diagram depicting a multi-band repeater (three repeaters) system.

Additionally, the IEEE 802.16-2004 standard defines a base station as a **single sector** entity supporting one frequency assignment.

Second, note that with respect to Fig. 2, the term "multi-band" is not similar to the claimed term *multi-sector*.

According to the Applicant's invention *multi-sector signals of a carrier frequency* may represent 3 sector signals assigned to a single carrier frequency (1-FA/3-sector).

According to Cook's disclosure, col. 4, lines 4-14, elements 128, 228, 328 referred to by the Examiner are three separate signals on three separate bands, *i.e.*:

As an exemplary first external signal (band) 128, an AMPS (Advanced Mobile Phone System) cellular telephone signal set is assumed. As a second external signal (band) 228, a PCS (Personal Communication System) cellular telephone signal set is assumed. As a third external signal (band) 328, a simplex (unidirectional) paging signal is assumed. Those skilled in the art will recognize that the above three assumed signals are exemplary only, representing frequency bands containing entire sets of signals, and that no restrictions as to either number or types of signals is implied.

Accordingly, external signals (bands) 128, 228, 328 are on separate carrier frequencies and

PATENT
P56924

there is no description suggesting that these signals are from the same cellular base station.

Third, Cook states in col. 4, lines 15-19 that "Each of first, second, and third external signals 128, 228, and 328 is unique unto itself. That is, the frequency bands, signal sets, protocols, etc., used by external signals 28 are different for each external signal 28. Therefore, each external signal 28 utilizes a different repeater 34." (Emphasis added) As can be seen in Fig. 2, there are three separate repeaters similar to the repeater of Fig. 1. Therefore, Cook fails to disclose or teach the claimed *master transmitting unit*.

Accordingly, Cook fails to disclose or teach the claimed *a master transmitting unit for receiving multi-sector signals of a carrier frequency from a base station*. Weissman fails to teach the claimed features noted as lacking in Cook. Therefore, claim 14 is non-obvious in view of the combination of Cook and Weissman, thus the rejection of claim 14 is deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is deemed to be non-obvious for the same reason as claim 14.

C. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as rendered obvious and unpatentable, over Cook et al. in view of Weissman et al. as applied to claims 14 and 15, and in further view of Souetinov (US 6,147,568). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reason(s).

PATENT
P56924

Souetinov fails to teach the claimed features noted as lacking in the combination of Cook and Weissman with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claim 16 is deemed to be non-obvious for the same reason as claim 14.

The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, withdraw the objections and/or rejections and pass the application to issue in view of the above amendments and/or remarks.

Should a Petition for extension of time be required with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is kindly requested to treat this paragraph as such a request and is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of the incurred fee if, and only if, a petition for extension of time be required and a check of the requisite amount is not enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27,774

1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56924
Date: 2/1/07
I.D.: REB/MDP